REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-14, 16-18, 20 and 22 are pending, with claims 1, 13 and 22 being independent.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-14, 16-18, 20 and 22 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 13, 18 and 22 have been amended herein to clarify the claimed invention. No new matter is entered.

Claim 13 has been objected to for a spelling error. Claim 13 has been corrected herein. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not meeting the 35 U.S.C. 101 requirements regarding the computer program language. It is believed the rejection refers to claim 18. Claim 18 has been amended herein to provide the proper language in order to overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,777,720 to Shapiro et al. (hereinafter Shapiro).

Claims 1 and 22

Applicant's claimed invention includes a user control for adjusting two stereoscopic parameters of the stereoscopic image displayed by the display elements. Specifically claim 1 recites: a single user control for adjusting the first and second distances of the stereoscopic image displayed by the display means.

In addition claim 22 further includes: "the plurality of lenticules having respective parallel axes extending transversely to the plurality of columns and rows of the display elements." (emphasis added).

First with regard to claim 22, the Office Action points to Shapiro stating: "One such display is an LCD with a lenticular screen (Col 13 Lines 30-38, Fig. 20)."

However col. 13, lines 30-38 and the entire reference fails to teach extending transversely to the plurality of columns and rows of the display elements. Shapiro only describes each lenticule of the screen 62 is aligned with a pair of strips. Shapiro fails to teach applicant's claimed feature.

With regard to applicant's claimed user control features of claims 1 and 22, these features provide the advantage of providing the user control adjusting the image to the user preference. Shapiro fails to teach such a feature.

Shapiro teaches a system which requires calibration for providing viewing zones where a controller is used to adjust and store illumination zones and provide user position tracking. Shapiro fails to provide any user control adjusting the first and second distances of the stereoscopic image displayed by the display means, where at least the first distance of the stereoscopic image displayed on the display means is adjusted to correspond to a distance between eyes of a user.

The Office Action points to Shapiro's tracking system, Figure 7, as showing such a feature. However, Shapiro admits such a system cannot adequately adjust to different interocular distances; furthermore, nowhere does Shapiro describe that a user can control the first distance as claimed.

Col. 11, lines 11-38 of Shapiro describe in certain types of such displays, and particularly in the beam combiner type of display illustrated in FIG. 7, misalignment of the optical elements may give rise to the condition illustrated in FIG. 11d in which the left and right eye viewing zones are vertically staggered. This can result from incorrect alignment of

one of the mirrors 3 and 6 with respect to the other mirror. FIG. 12a illustrates a modification of the display shown in FIG. 7 which allows misalignments of the type shown at FIG. 11d to be eliminated. Further, this modified arrangement is particularly suitable for matching the viewing zones to different interocular distances as illustrated in FIG. 11C.

Therefore Shapiro teaches that for interocular distances mirrors must be adjusted. Shapiro does not describe the distance between the two sub-images is adjusted by a user control.

For example col. 11, lines 41-61 of Shapiro describes the mirror 3 is mounted on a tilting mechanism 51 which is controlled by the data processor 50 so as to vary the orientation of the mirror about vertical and horizontal axes. The data processor analyses the images from the camera 37 and, when vertical staggering of the viewing zones of the type shown in FIG. 11d is detected, causes the mechanism 51 to vary the tilt of the mirror about the horizontal axis so as to ensure that the viewing zones become vertically aligned. FIG. 12a illustrates an adult observer having an interocular distance a. FIG. 12b illustrates the effect of correction for a child observer whose interocular distance b is less than a. The data processor detects the different interocular distance or the misalignment of the viewing zones laterally with respect to the actual observer eyes and moves the mirror about the vertical axis.

In contrast applicant is claiming in claim 1 a single user control for adjusting the first and second distances as particularly described in each of claims 1 and 22 is not found in Shapiro.

Claim 13

Independent claim 13 includes at least a similar limitation of controlling the first and second distances of the stereoscopic image in response to a user input via a single control so

that the first distance of the stereoscopic image is adjusted to correspond to a distance between eyes of a user.

As pointed out above with respect to claims 1 and 22, Shapiro fails to teach at these limitations of claim 13. Therefore the rejections should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 14

The claimed invention includes: "the axes of the lenticules extend transversely to the columns and rows of the display elements." (emphasis added).

The Office Action points to Shapiro, however as pointed out above Shapiro only describes each lenticule of the screen 62 is aligned with a pair of strips.

Dependent Claims 3, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20

These claims depend on Claims 1 and 13, respectively and, therefore, benefit from their respective patentability. Consequently, withdrawal and reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of remaining claims are in order.

Dependent Claims 5-7, 11 and 18

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro. Claims 5, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro in view of US Patent 6,816,158 to Lemelson et al. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro and Lemelson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,760,020 to Uchiyama.

With regard to dependent claim 18, Shapiro fails to teach at least the features of claim 13, therefore, claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

With regard to claims 5, 7 and 11 Lemelson teaches modifying only one parameter, the width of lines that controls a distance between two sub-images along an X axis.

Accordingly, Lemelson not only fails to teach adjusting "the first and second distances", but also the reference fails to teach "a single user control for adjusting the first and second distances", as specifically recited by the rejected claims.

Therefore Lemelson fails to cure the deficiencies of Shapiro and the rejections of claims 5, 7 and 11 should be withdrawn.

Furthermore Uchiyama describes modifying a stereoscopic image by adjusting an X-axis distance and a convergence angle by a stencil buffer. Uchiyama, col. 5, lines 1-11. Accordingly, as the Examiner admits, Uchiyama does not suggest using a single use control for adjusting the above-mentioned values. Therefore Uchiyama fails to cure the deficiencies of Shapiro and claim 6 should likewise be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance, however should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney to resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 29, 2006

Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
For Larry Liberchuk,
Registration No. 40,352

MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914)333-9602
Fax: (914)332-0615